

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

OpenTV, Inc.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. _____

**DECLARATION OF STEPHEN MELVIN, Ph.D.
IN SUPPORT OF APPLE INC.'S PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS
METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,055,169**

I, Stephen Melvin, hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have prepared this Declaration in connection with Apple Inc.'s Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,055,169 ("the '169 patent") (Ex. 1001), which is to be filed concurrently with this Declaration.

2. In the course of preparing this Declaration, I reviewed the '169 Patent, its prosecution file history, as well as the documents discussed in this Declaration.

3. I have been retained by Apple Inc. ("Apple" or "Petitioner") as an expert in the fields of computer science, computer communications, and related technologies. I am being compensated at my normal consulting rate of \$445 per hour for my time. My compensation is not dependent on and in no way affects the substance of my statements in this Declaration.

4. I have no financial interest in Apple. I similarly have no financial interest in the '169 Patent or the owner of the '169 Patent, and I have had no contact with the named inventors of the '169 Patent.

II. QUALIFICATIONS

5. I received a Ph.D. in Computer Science from the University of California at Berkeley in 1991 and a B.S. in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from the University of California at Berkeley in 1982. I have more than 30 years of

experience in computer science and computer engineering. I am an inventor on over 45 patents, and I am a registered patent agent before the USPTO.

6. My Ph.D. research areas included high-performance computer architecture and microarchitecture and microcode-based system performance analysis tools.

From September 2001 through April 2002, I was a Visiting Scholar at the University of Texas, Austin, where I directed graduate students in research in the area of high-performance computer architecture.

7. In May 2001, I co-founded and was the Chief Architect of Flowstorm, Inc., a start-up company based in Silicon Valley, where I defined and guided the overall chip architecture for a multithreaded packet processor. From March 2000 through May 2001, I worked as the Senior CPU Architect at Clearwater Networks, where I was involved in defining the architecture and microarchitecture of Clearwater's CNP810S multithreaded network processor.

8. From August 1983 to the present, I have been the President of Zytek Communications Corporation ("Zytek"). Zytek is an engineering, consulting, and small-scale manufacturing company that currently provides intellectual property consulting services as well as services related to the design, implementation, and testing of embedded systems. Zytek's general areas of activity have included industrial control and measurement, Internet-related services, hard disk analysis and file recovery, and computer engineering research services. Through my work

at Zytek, I have designed numerous microprocessor-based embedded systems, including analog and digital circuit design, firmware development for embedded microcontrollers, and software development for host interfacing, product development, and debugging.

9. I am a member of the following professional organizations: The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE); The Association for Computing Machinery (ACM); The American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA); The Intellectual Property Owners Association (IPO); and The National Association of Patent Practitioners (NAPP).

10. I served as General Chair of the 45th Annual International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Micro-45), held in Vancouver in December of 2012. I also served as co-chair of the 29th Annual International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Micro-29), held in Paris in December of 1996.

11. For further details regarding my employment and academic history, please refer to my curriculum vitae, attached as Ex. 1005.

III. RELEVANT LAW

12. I am not an attorney. For the purposes of this Declaration, I have been informed about certain aspects of the law that are relevant to my opinions. My understanding of the law is summarized below.

13. I have been informed and understand that claim construction is a matter of law and that the final claim constructions for this proceeding will be determined by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

14. I have been informed and understand that in the context of a covered business method patent review, a claim of an unexpired patent must be construed according to its broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification.

15. I have been informed and understand that a “technological invention” in the context of a CBM review refers to “whether the claimed subject matter as a whole recites a technological feature that is novel and unobvious over the prior art; and solves a technical problem using a technical solution.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.301(b).

16. I have been informed and understand that patent-eligibility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is determined by a two-step analysis set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) (the “*Alice* test”): (1) it is determined whether the claims at issue are directed to an abstract idea, and (2) if so, it is determined whether the claim’s elements “transform the nature of the claim” into a patent-eligible application.

IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

17. Based on my review of the ’169 Patent and my background and experience in the field of computer science, it is my opinion that one of ordinary skill in the art as of the priority date would be someone with a bachelor’s degree in computer

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.